1 2 3 4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 6 KENNETH HATLEN, 3:12-cv-00534-MMD-WGC 7 REPORT & RECOMMENDATION OF Plaintiff, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE 8 v. 9 MARY WALSH, et. al., 10 Defendants. 11 This Report and Recommendation is made to the Honorable Miranda M. Du, United 12 States District Judge. This action was referred to the undersigned Magistrate Judge pursuant to 13 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and the Local Rules of Practice (LR) 1B 1-4. Before the court is 14 Plaintiff's motion titled: "Emergency-Protection." (Doc. # 311.)¹ 15 I. BACKGROUND 16 A. Summary of Action 17 At all relevant times, Plaintiff was an inmate in custody of the Nevada Department of 18 Corrections (NDOC). (Pl.'s Am. Compl., Doc. # 22.) The events giving rise to this action took 19 place while Plaintiff was housed at Ely State Prison (ESP) and Northern Nevada Correctional 20 Center (NNCC). (*Id.*; Screening Order, Doc. # 44.) 21 Currently, the defendants include: Ronald Abeloe, Kitekeiaho Afeaki, Robert Banchi, 22 Renee Baker, Dr. Robert Bannister, Chad Bowler, Ronald Bryant, Harold M. Byrne, Adam 23 Caldwell, John Cardella, Joshua Clark, James "Greg" Cox, Russell Donnelly, Sheryl Foster, 24 Ronald Hannah, Justin Henley, Gail Holmes, Brea Howard, Helen Hubbard, Nathan Hughes, 25 Danielle Iratcabal, Bert Jackson, Dillyn Keith, Koree Kirkpatric, Sr., Dr. Michael Koehn, 26 Brandon Lawrence, Dr. David Mar, Robert Meares, James Mitchell, Ronnie Montoya, Roger 27 28

¹ Refers to court's docket number.

Mooney, Dwight Neven, Eric Ortiz, Jack Palmer, Jacob Parr, Westly Radford, Dr. Julie Rexwinkel, Larry Rickman, Kathryn Rose, Tasheena Sandoval, Andrew Silverstein, Elizabeth "Lisa" Walsh, and April Witter. (*See* Doc. # 202, Doc. # 216, Doc. # 247.)

Plaintiff has also named defendants Brown and Thompson; however, the Attorney General's Office has not accepted service on behalf of those individuals and they have not yet been served. (*Id.*) Plaintiff has also named Randy Tice, but service has not yet been effectuated as to that individual. (*See* Docs. # 206, # 254.)

On screening, the court determined Plaintiff could proceed with claims for retaliation,
Eighth Amendment conditions of confinement, Eighth Amendment failure to protect, Eighth
Amendment deliberate indifference to a serious medical need, due process, and First Amendment
speech and religious rights claims against these defendants. (Doc. # 44.)

B. Summary of Motion

In this motion, Plaintiff references "letters of notification" referenced as "# 1390 and 1391" that he says he sent to Warden Baker telling her to respond. (Doc. # 311 at 1.) He vaguely references an assault that caused him injury, the denial of medical provisions, concealment of crime, threats and failure to provide security that he notified Warden Baker of in the letter. (*Id.*) He then references the fact that his grievances and kites have been refused and that his legal documents have been taken. (*Id.* at 2.) He states that he is seeking a temporary restraining order and injunction; immediate transfer to NNCC; and an immediate hearing with the courts. (*Id.* at 3.) He goes on to attach various documents, which consist mostly of grievance forms, but also includes a few kites, and a letter to the medical director. (*Id.* at 4-25.)

II. DISCUSSION

A preliminary injunction is an "extraordinary and drastic remedy" that is never awarded as a right. *Munaf v. Geren*, 553 U.S. 674, 689-90 (2008). Instead, courts must "balance competing claims of injury and...the effect of the granting or withholding of the requested relief." *Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 24 (2008) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted). A plaintiff seeking an injunction must demonstrate: (1) a likelihood of success on the merits; (2) a likelihood of suffering irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary

1	relief; (3) the balance of equities tips in his or her favor; and (4) an injunction is in the public
2	interest. Winter, 555 U.S. at 20. The standard for issuing a temporary restraining order is
3	identical to the standard for a preliminary injunction. See Stuhlbarg Int'l Sales Co., Inc. v. John
4	D. Brush and Co., Inc., 240 F.3d 832, 839 n. 7 (9th Cir. 2001). Plaintiff has not addressed any of
5	these factors establishing he is entitled to injunctive relief.
6	Moreover, Plaintiff has been advised on countless occasions now that a request for
7	injunctive relief filed in this action must be related to the claims proceeding in this action. See,
8	e.g., Little v. Jones, 607 F.3d 1245, 1250-51 (10th Cir. 2010); Colvin v. Caruso, 605 F.3d 282,
9	299-300 (6th Cir. 2010); Omega World Travel, Inc. v. Trans World Airlines, 111 F.3d 14, 16 (4th
10	Cir. 1997). Devose v. Herrington, 42 F.3d 470, 471 (8th Cir. 1994).
11	This action involves claims brought under the Eighth and First Amendments concerning
12	alleged conduct that occurred while Plaintiff was housed at ESP and NNCC in 2012. (See Doc. #
13	44.) Plaintiff's request for injunctive relief appears to relate to conduct that occurred very
14	recently, as best the court can ascertain. Therefore, Plaintiff's motion should be denied.
15	III. RECOMMENDATION
16	IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that the District Judge issue an order <u>DENYING</u>
16 17	IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that the District Judge issue an order <u>DENYING</u> Plaintiff's motion (Doc. # 311).
17	Plaintiff's motion (Doc. # 311).
17 18	Plaintiff's motion (Doc. # 311). The parties should be aware of the following:
17 18 19	Plaintiff's motion (Doc. # 311). The parties should be aware of the following: 1. That they may file, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), specific written objections to
17 18 19 20	Plaintiff's motion (Doc. # 311). The parties should be aware of the following: 1. That they may file, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation within fourteen days of receipt. These objections should be
17 18 19 20 21	Plaintiff's motion (Doc. # 311). The parties should be aware of the following: 1. That they may file, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation within fourteen days of receipt. These objections should be titled "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation" and should be
17 18 19 20 21 22	Plaintiff's motion (Doc. # 311). The parties should be aware of the following: 1. That they may file, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation within fourteen days of receipt. These objections should be titled "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation" and should be accompanied by points and authorities for consideration by the district judge.
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Plaintiff's motion (Doc. # 311). The parties should be aware of the following: 1. That they may file, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation within fourteen days of receipt. These objections should be titled "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation" and should be accompanied by points and authorities for consideration by the district judge. 2. That this Report and Recommendation is not an appealable order and that any notice of
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Plaintiff's motion (Doc. # 311). The parties should be aware of the following: 1. That they may file, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation within fourteen days of receipt. These objections should be titled "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation" and should be accompanied by points and authorities for consideration by the district judge. 2. That this Report and Recommendation is not an appealable order and that any notice of appeal pursuant to Rule 4(a)(1) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure should not be filed

28